

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Status of Claims:

“Withdrawn from consideration” claims 5-20 are currently being cancelled, whereby Applicants reserve the right to prosecute these claims in a divisional application, if desired.

Claims 1, 21 and 22 are currently being amended, without affecting the scope of those claims.

Claims 23-28 are currently being added.

This amendment and reply amends, adds and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending, adding and canceling the claims as set forth above, claims 1-4 and 21-28 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103:

In the Office Action, claims 1-4 and 21-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0154390 to Yamauchi et al. (hereinafter “Yamauchi”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0023638 to Weight and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0163724 to Tayebi et al. (hereinafter “Yayebi”). This rejection is traversed for at least the reasons given below.

(A) “a collection processing unit”:

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi teaches “a collection processing unit...”, and refers to Fig. 3 and paragraphs [0066], [0068] and [0071] of Yamauchi. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Figure 3 or in paragraphs [0066], [0068] and [0071] of Yamauchi with respect to **“a collection processing unit which collects content information items stored in different specific forms in storage devices connected to networks using different protocols.”** Please note that the “content information items” indicates **“attributes of contents”**, as explicitly recited in independent claims 1, 21 and 22.

In the ‘Response to Arguments’ section, the Office Action asserts that “content types are part of content attributes.” The word “type” can be found in paragraph [0066], lines 6 and 14; and in paragraph [0071], lines 4 and 9 of Yamauchi. However, even if the “type” can be regarded as the part of the **“attributes of contents,”** Yamauchi is silent with regard to the collection of **“content information items indicating attributes of contents.”** Furthermore, Yamauchi is silent with regard to the collection of **“the content information items stored in different specific forms in storage devices.”**

To cure the deficiency of Yamauchi, the Office Action relies on Weight for allegedly teaching “a collection processing unit...”, whereby the Office Action refers to Figure 5, Table 1.1, and paragraphs [0035] and [0042] of Weight. However, Weight merely teaches that a content collector 202 accesses to the content providers each connected **using the same protocol** (“not” **using different protocols**) and acquires **a content** (“not” **content information items indicating attributes of contents**) from the content providers. Even if such content collector 202 of Weight is applied to the Yamauchi’s system, it is not possible for such a combined system to **collect content information items (indicating attributes of contents) stored in different specific forms in storage devices connected to networks using different protocols**, as explicitly recited in independent claims 1, 21 and 22.

Regarding “using different protocol,” the Office Action asserts that Tayebi teaches storage devices connected together in accordance with known network protocols, whereby the Office Action refers to page 9, paragraph [0122] of Tayebi. However, Tayebi does not teach or suggest that **content information items (indicating attributes of contents) is stored in different specific forms in storage devices connected to networks using different protocols**. Tayebi merely teaches that, concerning the functions of the IDC 11 (in Figure 2 of Tayebi), functionalities can be divided between a plurality of computing and storage devices or servers connected together in accordance with known network protocols.

Accordingly, the combination of Yamauchi, Weight and Tayebi does not teach or suggest the claimed collection processing unit.

(B) “a conversion processing unit”:

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi teaches “a conversion processing unit...”, and refers to page 5, paragraph [0068] of Yamauchi. However, Yamauchi merely teaches that the converting device 39A (in Figure 2 of Yamauchi) converts **a content** (“not” **content**

information items indicating **attributes of contents**) into another format, for example, from the MEG 2 format into MPEG 4 format, or from a high-definition television (HDTV) format into the standard-definition television format. Even if the above-described “type” can be regarded as the part of the **attributes of contents**, the converting device 39A (in Figure 2 of Yamauchi) merely converts a **content** into another format, and consequently, the “type” may be merely converted into another type. It is to be noted that Yamauchi fails to teach or suggest converting each of **content information items (indicating attributes of contents)** collected by a collection processing unit into content information of a **standardized form**.

Accordingly, Yamauchi does not teach or suggest the claimed conversion processing unit.

(C) “an output unit”:

The Office Action asserts that Yamauchi teaches “an output unit...”, and refers to pages 6-7, paragraphs [0068] and [0089] of Yamauchi. However, Yamauchi merely teaches that monitor section 17 (in Figure 3 of Yamauchi) displays **contents** (“not” the **content information of the standardized form converted by the conversion processing unit**).

Accordingly, Yamauchi does not teach or suggest the claimed output unit.

Therefore, independent claims 1, 21 and 22 are patentable over the combined teachings of the cited art of record.

New Claims:

New claims 23-28 have been added to recite additional features of the present invention that are believed to provide an additional basis of patentability for these claims. Support for new claims 23, 25 and 27 may be found on page 11 of the specification, and support for new claims 24, 26 and 28 may be found on pages 14-16 of the specification.

Conclusion:

Since all of the issues raised in the Office Action have been addressed in this Amendment and Reply, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check or credit card payment form being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicants hereby petition for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorize payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date March 6, 2008

By Phillip J. Articola

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23392
Telephone: (202) 945-6162
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Pavan K. Agarwal
Registration No. 40,888

Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819